

No. PD-0556-20

IN THE TEXAS COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS

FILED
COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS
12/29/2020
DEANA WILLIAMSON, CLERK

PHI VAN DO

Respondent (Appellant in the Court of Appeals)

v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS

Petitioner (Appellee in the Court of Appeals)

On Review from No. 14-18-00600-CR
in which the Fourteenth District Court of Appeals
considered Cause Number 2130699
from County Criminal Court at Law No. 10
Harris County, Texas
Hon. Dan Spjut, Judge Presiding

**RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
RESPONSE TO STATE'S REPLY BRIEF ON DISCRETIONARY REVIEW**

ORAL ARGUMENT ORDERED

ALEXANDER BUNIN
Chief Public Defender
Harris County, Texas

TED WOOD
Assistant Public Defender
Harris County, Texas
State Bar of Texas No. 21907800
1201 Franklin, 13th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 274-6705
Fax: (713) 368-9278
ted.wood@pdo.hctx.net

Counsel for Respondent

TO THE HONORABLE PRESIDING JUDGE KELLER AND THE JUDGES OF
THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS OF TEXAS:

This Court granted the State's petition for discretionary review on September 30, 2020. The parties were directed to participate in oral argument on a date that has not yet been specified.

The State advanced the following three grounds for review and this Court granted discretionary review on the basis of all three grounds:

- (1) The Fourteenth Court erred by applying the constitutional harm standard to unobjected-to charge error;
- (2) Alternatively, the Fourteenth Court erred by concluding that a punishment-phase objection preserved error in the guilt-phase charge; and
- (3) The Fourteenth Court erred by finding reversible harm even though the error concerned an uncontested matter established by objective facts.

On October 8, 2020, the State filed a brief in this Court expounding on these grounds. On November 24, 2020, the Respondent (Mr. Phi Van Do) filed his brief. In his brief, Mr. Do noted that all three grounds for review were premised on the existence of jury-charge error. He then argued that the Fourteenth Court of Appeals had erred in finding jury-charge error. Accordingly, Mr. Do's brief did not focus on the three grounds for review advanced by the State. Instead, he focused on the threshold question of whether there was any jury-charge error in the first place.

On December 15, 2020, the State obtained leave to file a brief responding to Mr. Do's brief. The State filed a reply brief the same day. This was totally appropriate. The State's brief was a direct response to Mr. Do's argument that there was no jury-charge error in the first place. Of course, the State had not briefed this issue in its initial brief.

The "State's Reply Brief on Discretionary Review" is well written. Mr. Do desires to file a response to the State's brief. Mr. Do envisions that the threshold question of whether there was any jury-charge error in the case will be a subject of oral argument. By permitting a response to the State's brief, the question of whether jury-charge error exists can be better presented to this Court before oral argument.

Accordingly, Mr. Do respectfully requests that this Court grant this motion and permit him to file a brief responding to the State's reply brief. Mr. Do is, of course, willing to abide by any deadline and word limit that this Court may choose to impose on his responsive brief.

Respectfully submitted,

ALEXANDER BUNIN
Chief Public Defender
Harris County Texas

/s/ Ted Wood
TED WOOD
Assistant Public Defender

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on December 28, 2020, I provided this brief to the Harris County District Attorney via the EFILETEXAS.gov e-filing system. Specifically, service was made on Mr. Clint Morgan. This service is required by Texas Rule of Appellate Procedure 9.5.

Additionally, I certify that on December 28, 2020, I provided this brief to the State Prosecuting Attorney via the EFILETEXAS.gov e-filing system. This service is required by Texas Rules of Appellate Procedure 68.11 and 70.3.

/s/ Ted Wood
TED WOOD
Assistant Public Defender
Attorney for Respondent

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the eFiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the eFiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Ashley Davila on behalf of Ted Wood
Bar No. 21907800
Ashley.Davila@pdo.hctx.net
Envelope ID: 49229490
Status as of 12/28/2020 10:20 AM CST

Associated Case Party: State of Texas

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Clint Morgan		morgan_clinton@dao.hctx.net	12/28/2020 7:17:05 AM	SENT

Associated Case Party: Phi Do

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Ted Wood		ted.wood@pdo.hctx.net	12/28/2020 7:17:05 AM	SENT

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
Stacey Soule		information@spa.texas.gov	12/28/2020 7:17:05 AM	SENT